

LOCAL REGULARITY OF THE BERGMAN PROJECTION ON A CLASS OF PSEUDOCONVEX DOMAINS OF FINITE TYPE

TRAN VU KHANH AND ANDREW RAICH

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to prove L^p -Sobolev and Hölder estimates for the Bergman projection on a class of pseudoconvex domains that admit a “good” dilation and satisfy Bell-Ligocka’s Condition R. We prove that this class of domains includes the h -extendible domains, a large class of weakly pseudoconvex domains of finite type.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. The Bergman projection $B = B_\Omega$ is one of the fundamental objects associated to Ω ; it is the orthogonal projection of $L^2(\Omega)$ onto the closed subspace of square-integrable holomorphic functions on Ω . We can express the Bergman projection via the integral representation

$$Bv(z) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(z, w)v(w) dw,$$

where dw is the Lebesgue measure on Ω , and the integral kernel $\mathcal{B}$ is called the Bergman kernel.

Since the Bergman projection is defined abstractly on $L^2(\Omega)$, basic questions about B are the local and global regularity and estimates in other spaces, namely

- (1) C^∞ and L_s^2 , and
- (2) L_s^p ($p \neq 2$) and the Hölder continuous functions Λ_s .

Although when Ω is of finite type (see [D’A82]), Question 1 has been completely answered [Cat83, Cat87, KN65, FK72], we focus on aspects of the problem that relate directly to the Bergman projection and tools that we can apply in $L_s^p(\Omega)$ and Hölder spaces. Condition R is a well known property introduced by Bell and Ligocka [BL80] to study the smoothness of biholomorphic mappings and is intimately connected with Question 1. We will introduce a local version and refer to original as global Condition R. Specifically, for a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, we say that Ω satisfies *global Condition R* if for any $s \geq 0$ there is $M = M_s$ such that

$$\|Bu\|_{L_s^2(\Omega)} \leq c_s \|u\|_{L_{s+M}^2(\Omega)}$$

for any $u \in L_{s+M}^2(\Omega)$.

Global Condition R suggests the following local version. For a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $z_0 \in \Omega$, we say that Ω satisfies *local Condition R at z_0* if there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 such that for any $s, m \geq 0$ there is $M = M_{s,m}$ and a constant $c = c_{s,M} > 0$ such that

$$\|\chi_1 Bu\|_{L_s^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq c \|\chi_2 u\|_{L_{s+M}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\chi_3 Bu\|_{L_{-m}^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad (1.1)$$

for any $u \in L_{s+M}^2(V \cap \Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega)$, where $\chi_j \in C_c^\infty(U)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\chi_j \prec \chi_{j+1}$.

We will use the following notation throughout this paper. For cutoff functions $\chi, \chi' \in C_c^\infty(U)$, we write $\chi \prec \chi'$ if $\chi' = 1$ on $\text{supp}(\chi)$. We use the notation $a \lesssim b$ (respectively, $a \gtrsim b$) if there exists a global constant $c > 0$ so that $a \leq cb$ (respectively, $a \geq cb$). Moreover, we will use $\approx$ for the combination of $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$. Also, $L_s^p(\Omega)$ are the usual L^p -Sobolev spaces of order s on Ω . The space

The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1405100.

$L_s^{p'}(\Omega)$ is the dual space of $(L_s^p(\Omega))_0$, which is the closure of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ in $L_s^p(\Omega)$. Here, p and p' are Hölder conjugates.

Global Condition R often arises as a consequence of estimates used to prove global regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator. In particular, compactness estimates (which themselves are a consequence of Catlin's Property (P) or McNeal's Property ($\tilde{P}$) or the existence of a plurisubharmonic defining functions both imply the global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator [Cat84, McN02, BS91]. See [Str08, Har11] for more general sufficient conditions for global regularity.

Similarly, local Condition R is a consequence of the local regularity theory for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. It is classical that subelliptic estimate for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem implies this local property [KN65, FK72]. Subellipticity itself is equivalent to a finite type condition on the boundary [Cat83, Cat87].

The positive answer of (2) has been obtained when Ω is of finite type and satisfies the one of the following settings:

1. strongly pseudoconvex [FS74, PS77].
2. pseudoconvex in $\mathbb{C}^2$ [Chr88, FK88a, FK88b, McN89, NRSW89, CNS92]
3. pseudoconvex in $\mathbb{C}^n$ whose Levi-form has comparable eigenvalues [Koe02], or one degenerate eigenvalue [Mac88].
4. decoupled [FKM90, CD06, NS06].
5. convex in $\mathbb{C}^n$ [McN94, MS94, MS97].

The purpose of this paper is to give a full answer to Question 2 for a class of pseudoconvex domains of finite type that admit a good anisotropic dilation, and these scalings turn out to be closely related to Catlin's multitype. This class of domains includes h -extendible domains (defined below) as well as types 1-4 above [Yu94, Yu95].

Recall that a defining function ρ for a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a C^1 function defined on a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ so that $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) < 0\}$, $\text{b}\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) = 0\}$, and $\nabla \rho \neq 0$ on $\text{b}\Omega$. In this paper, we reserve $r = r_\Omega$ for the signed distance to the boundary function.

Definition 1.1. Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with smooth boundary $\text{b}\Omega$. Let $z_0 \in \text{b}\Omega$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be coordinates so that z_0 is the origin and $\text{Re } z_1$ is the real normal direction to $\text{b}\Omega$ at z_0 . We say that Ω has a *good anisotropic dilation at z_0* if there exist smooth, increasing functions $\phi_j : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, so that $\frac{\phi_j(\delta)}{\delta}$ is decreasing and $\phi_1(\delta) := \delta$ and for any small $\delta > 0$, the anisotropic dilation

$$\hat{z} = \Phi_\delta(z) = \left(\frac{z_1}{\phi_1(\delta)}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{\phi_n(\delta)} \right) : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$$

satisfies two conditions:

- (1) For each j , the inequality

$$\left| \frac{\partial r}{\partial z_j}(z) \right| \lesssim \frac{\delta}{\phi_j(\delta)}$$

holds for all $z \in \Phi_\delta^{-1}(B(0, 1))$.

- (2) The Bergman operator B_δ of the scaled domain $\Omega_\delta := \Phi_\delta(\Omega)$ satisfies the local Condition R at $\hat{z}_0 = \Phi_\delta(z_0)$ with uniform estimates on δ . This means that there exist a neighborhood U of $\hat{z}_0$ (independence of δ) such that for any $\chi_j \in C_c^\infty(U)$ such that $\chi_1 \prec \chi_2 \prec \chi_3$ and for any $s, m > 0$ there exists $M = M_{s,m}$ such that

$$\|\chi_1 B_\delta u\|_{L_{s+M}^2(\Omega_\delta)}^2 \leq c_s \left(\|\chi_2 u\|_{L_{s+M}^2(\Omega_\delta)}^2 + \|\chi_3 B_\delta u\|_{L_{-m}^2(\Omega_\delta)}^2 \right) \quad (1.2)$$

holds for any $u \in L_{s+M}^2(U \cap \Omega_\delta) \cap L^2(\Omega_\delta)$, where the constant c_s is independent of δ .

The non-isotropic distance from z to w with respect to this dilation is defined by

$$\delta_{NI}(z, w) := \max\{\phi_1^*(|z_1 - w_1|), \dots, \phi_n^*(|z_n - w_n|), |r(z)|, r(w)\},$$

where $*$ denotes the function inversion operator, i.e., $\phi^*(\phi(z)) = z$. Our first goal of this paper is the estimates for derivatives of the Bergman kernel.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and z_0 be a boundary point. Assume that Ω has a good anisotropic dilation $\Phi_\delta(z) = (\frac{z_1}{\phi_1(\delta)}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{\phi_n(\delta)})$ at z_0 . Then there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 such that*

$$\left| (\Pi_{j=1}^n D_{z_j, \bar{w}_j}^{\alpha_j}) \mathcal{B}(z, w) \right| \leq c \prod_{j=1}^n (\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)))^{-2-\alpha_j}$$

for any $(z, w) \in (\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times (\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \setminus \{\text{diagonal}\}$ and any nonnegative integers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. The constant c is independent of z, w .

The second goal of this paper is to establish local L^p -Sobolev and Hölder estimates for the Bergman projection.

Theorem 1.3. *Let Ω be a smooth, bounded, pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Assume that Ω has a good anisotropic dilation and satisfies global Condition R. Then the Bergman projection B is locally regular in both L_s^p with $s \geq 0$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and Λ_s with $s > 0$ near z_0 .*

Namely, there exists $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ so that whenever $\chi_0, \chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(U)$ with $\chi_0 \prec \chi_1$ and $\chi_0 \equiv 1$ near z_0 , there exists constants $c_s, c_{s,p} > 0$ so that

$$\|\chi_0 Bv\|_{L_s^p(\Omega)} \leq c_{s,p} (\|\chi_1 v\|_{L_s^p(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L_0^p(\Omega)})$$

for any $v \in L_s^p(\Omega \cap U) \cap L^p(\Omega)$, $s \geq 0$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$; and

$$\|\chi_0 Bv\|_{\Lambda_s(\Omega)} \leq c_s (\|\chi_1 v\|_{\Lambda_s(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})$$

for any $v \in \Lambda_s(\Omega \cap U) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $s > 0$.

We remind the reader of the definition of the Hölder spaces $\Lambda_s(\Omega)$ below (Definition 4.3).

We now turn to applications of Theorem 1.3. Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and p be a boundary point. There are several notions of the “type” of a point that aim to measure the curvature of $b\Omega$ at p . Two of the most widely known are the

- D’Angelo (multi)-type, $\Delta(p) = (\Delta_n(p), \dots, \Delta_1(p))$ where $\Delta_k(p)$ is the k -type, which measures the maximal order of contact of k -dimensional varieties with $b\Omega$ at p ; and
- Catlin multitype, $\mathcal{M} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$, where m_k is the optimal weight assigned to the coordinate direction z_k .

With these definitions, $\Delta_n(p) = m_1 = 1$. In [Cat87], Catlin proved that $\mathcal{M}(p) \leq \Delta(p)$ in the sense that $m_{n-k+1}(p) \leq \Delta_k(p) < \infty$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. The following definition is given by Yu:

Definition 1.4. A pseudoconvex domain is called to be an h -extendible domain at p if $\Delta(p) = \mathcal{M}(p)$. If Ω is h -extendible at p , $\mathcal{M}(p)$ is called the multitype at p .

In [Yu94], Yu proves h -extendibility at p is equivalent to the existence of coordinates $z = (z_1, z')$ centered at p and a defining function ρ that can be expanded near 0 as follows:

$$\rho(z) = \operatorname{Re} z_1 + P(z') + R(z).$$

Here P is a $(\frac{1}{m_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{m_n})$ -homogeneous plurisubharmonic polynomial, i.e.,

$$P(\delta^{1/m_2} z_2, \dots, \delta^{1/m_n} z_n) = \delta P(z_2, \dots, z_n) \quad (1.3)$$

and contains no pluriharmonic terms. The function R is smooth and satisfies

$$R(z) = o\left(\sum_{j=1}^n |z_j|^{m_j+\eta}\right) \quad (1.4)$$

for some $\eta > 0$.

The h -extendible property allows for a pseudoconvex domain Ω to be approximated by a pseudoconvex domain from the outside. See [BSY95, Yu94, Yu95] for a discussion.

Corollary 1.5. *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and z_0 be a boundary point. Assume that Ω satisfies the global Condition R is h -extendible at z_0 . Then the conclusion of Theorem 1.3 holds.*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall results on local L_s^2 estimates and C^∞ -regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator and the Bergman projection. In Section 3, we give a proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 5, we prove Corollary 1.5.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their gratitude to Professor Emil Straube of Texas A&M University for his comments and suggestions.

2. UNIFORM ESTIMATES ON THE BERGMAN KERNEL

2.1. The smoothness of kernels: local behavior. In this section, Ω is a smooth, bounded pseudoconvex domain and $z_0 \in b\Omega$ is a point at which the local Condition R holds. We start our estimate of the Bergman kernel by proving that $\mathcal{B}(z, w)$ is smooth near the diagonal and satisfies uniform estimates when the points z and w are a uniform distance apart.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a smooth, bounded pseudoconvex domain satisfies local Condition R at $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Then the Bergman kernel is smooth on $((\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times (\bar{\Omega} \cap U)) \setminus \{\text{Diagonal of } b\Omega \cap U\}$. Moreover, for any $(z, w) \in ((\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times (\bar{\Omega} \cap U))$ if the isotropic distance of Ω*

$$\delta_I(z, w) := \max\{|r(z)|, |r(w)|, |z - w|\} \gtrsim 1$$

then

$$|D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w)| \leq c_{\alpha, \beta, U}$$

where $c_{\alpha, \beta, U}$ is independent of z, w .

Proof. We wish to apply B to a smoothly approximated Dirac delta function, so we let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1))$ where $\psi \geq 0$, radial, and $\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \psi dw = 1$. Fix $w \in \Omega$ and set $\psi_t(\zeta) = t^{-2n} \psi((\zeta - w)/t)$. When $z \neq w$, the fact that $\mathcal{B}(z, w)$ is harmonic in w means that for t small enough

$$D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mathcal{B}(z, \zeta) D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \psi_t(\zeta) d\zeta = (-1)^{|\beta|} \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mathcal{B}(z, \zeta) D_{\bar{\zeta}}^\beta \psi_t(\zeta) d\zeta = (-1)^{|\beta|} (BD^\beta \psi_t)(z).$$

Since the Bergman operator is locally C^∞ regularity,

$$D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w) = (-1)^{|\beta|} (D^\alpha BD^\beta \psi_t)(z) \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \cap U)$$

The hypothesis $\delta_I(z, w) \approx 1$ implies that either $|z - w| \approx 1$, $|r(z)| \approx 1$, or $|r(w)| \approx 1$.

Case 1: $|z - w| \approx 1$. We choose ϵ sufficiently small such that $B(z, 2\epsilon) \cap B(w, 2\epsilon) = \emptyset$ and $B(z, 2\epsilon), B(w, 2\epsilon) \subset U$. Let $\chi_1 \prec \chi_2 \prec \chi_3$ such that $\chi_1 = 1$ on $B(z, \epsilon)$ and $\text{supp}(\chi_3) \subset B(z, 2\epsilon)$. By Sobolev Lemma, we have (for $t < \epsilon/2$)

$$|D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w)| \leq \sup_{\xi \in B(z, \epsilon) \cap \bar{\Omega}} |D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(\xi, w)| \lesssim \|\chi_1 BD^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_{2n+|\alpha|}^2(\Omega)}. \quad (2.1)$$

Using (1.1) for $u = D^\beta \psi_t$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_1 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L^2_{2n+|\alpha|}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\chi_2 D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L^2_s(\Omega)} + \|\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= \|\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

where s depends on $2n + |\alpha|$. Here the equality follows by $\text{supp}(\chi_j) \cap \text{supp}(\psi_t) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, by the density of smooth, compactly supported forms in $L^2(\Omega)^{(0,1)}$,

$$\|\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \sup\{ |(\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| : \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 1, v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)^{(0,1)} \}.$$

Using the self-adjointness of B and the pairing of $(L^2_{2n}(\Omega))_0$ with its dual $L^2_{-2n}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| &= |(\psi_t, D^\beta B \chi_3 v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \\ &= |(\psi_t, \tilde{\chi}_1 D^\beta B \chi_3 v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \\ &= \|\psi_t\|_{L^2_{-2n}(\Omega)} \|\tilde{\chi}_1 D^\beta B \chi_3 v\|_{L^2_{2n}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_1$ is chosen such that $\tilde{\chi}_1 = 1$ on $B(w, \epsilon)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_1 \prec \tilde{\chi}_2 \prec \tilde{\chi}_3$ with $\text{supp}(\tilde{\chi}_3) \subset B(w, 2\epsilon)$; in particular, $\text{supp}(\tilde{\chi}_2) \cap \text{supp}(\chi_3) = \emptyset$. Since $\psi_t \rightarrow \delta_w$ in $(C^0(\mathbb{C}^n))^*$ and $L^2_{2n}(\mathbb{C}^n) \subset C^0_0(\mathbb{C}^n)$ by Sobolev's Lemma, it follows from duality that

$$\|\psi_t\|_{L^2_{-2n}(\Omega)} \lesssim 1.$$

By a second application of the inequality (1.1) for cut-off functions $\tilde{\chi}_1, \tilde{\chi}_2$ and $\tilde{\chi}_3$ and the fact that $\tilde{\chi}_2 \chi_3 = 0$ by support considerations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\chi}_1 D^\beta B \chi_3 v\|_{L^2_{2n}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\tilde{\chi}_2 \chi_3 v\|_{L^2_s(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\chi}_3 B \chi_3 v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= \|\tilde{\chi}_3 B \chi_3 v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|B \chi_3 v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\chi_3 v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

since B is an orthogonal projection on $L^2(\Omega)$.

Case 2: $|r(z)| \approx 1$ or $|r(w)| \approx 1$. Assume $|r(z)| \approx 1$. If w is near the boundary then $|z - w| \approx 1$, and the conclusion follows from Case 1. Otherwise z is near w , and we can use the interior elliptic regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem to obtain

$$|D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w)| \leq c_{\alpha, \beta}$$

where $c_{\alpha, \beta}$ is independent of both z, w and the diameter of Ω when $|r(z)| \approx |r(w)| \approx 1$ (see [Ker72, Theorem 1]).

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

2.2. The smoothness of kernels: local/nonlocal. In this subsection we state and prove the smoothness of the Bergman kernel in the case that one point is in a neighborhood of the point at which the f -property holds and the other is not. In this subsection, we observe that our estimates may depend on diameter of Ω , however, we will only apply these estimates for a fixed domain.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain. Assume that local Condition R holds at $z_0 \in b\Omega$, and global Condition R holds for Ω . Then there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 such that the Bergman kernel is smooth on $((\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times \bar{\Omega}) \setminus \{\text{Diagonal of } b\Omega \cap U\}$. Moreover, for any $(z, w) \in ((\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times \bar{\Omega})$ if*

$$|z - w| \gtrsim 1,$$

then we have

$$|D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w)| \leq c_{\alpha, \beta}$$

where $c_{\alpha, \beta}$ is independent of z, w .

Proof. Adopting the notation and argument from the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_z^\alpha D_{\bar{w}}^\beta \mathcal{B}(z, w)| &\leq \|\chi_1 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_{2n+|\alpha|}^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \|\chi_2 D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_s^2(\Omega)} + \|\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_{-m}^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \|\chi_3 B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_{-m}^2(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

where m will be chosen later. However,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|B D^\beta \psi_t\|_{L_{-m}^2(\Omega)} &= \sup\{|(B D^\beta \psi_t, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| : \|v\|_{L_m^2(\Omega)} \leq 1\} \\
&= \sup\{|(\psi_t, D^\beta B v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| : \|v\|_{L_m^2(\Omega)} \leq 1\} \\
&\leq \sup\{\|\psi_t\|_{L_{-2n}^2(\Omega)} \|B v\|_{L_{2n+|\beta|}^2(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L_m^2(\Omega)} \leq 1\} \\
&\lesssim \sup\{\|v\|_{L_{2n+|\beta|+M}^2(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L_m^2(\Omega)} \leq 1\} \\
&\lesssim 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the facts that $\|\psi_t\|_{L_{-2n}^2(\Omega)} \lesssim 1$ and the global Condition R with the choice $m \geq 2n + |\beta| + M$. $\square$

Remark 2.3. In [Boa87], Boas proved a result similar to Theorem 2.2 with stronger hypothesis that $z \in \text{b}\Omega$ is a point of finite type and Catlin's Property (P) holds.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

The following lemma follows easily by the definitions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\hat{z} := \Phi_\delta(z)$, $\hat{u}(\hat{z}) := u(z)$. Then, any $z \in U$*

$$(\Pi_{j=1}^n D_{z_j}^{\alpha_j}) u(z) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (\phi_j(\delta))^{-\alpha_j} \right) \left(\Pi_{j=1}^n D_{\hat{z}_j}^{\alpha_j} \right) \hat{u}(\hat{z}).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2 for the Bergman kernel. For $z, w \in \bar{\Omega} \cap U$, denote $\hat{z} = \Phi_\delta(z)$, $\hat{w} = \Phi_\delta(w)$. By the transformation law for the Bergman kernel under biholomorphic mappings, we have

$$\mathcal{B}_\Omega(z, w) = \det J_{\mathbb{C}} \Phi_\delta(z) \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w}) \overline{\det J_{\mathbb{C}} \Phi_\delta(w)} = \prod_{j=1}^n (\phi_j(\delta))^{-2} \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w}). \quad (3.1)$$

Next, fix $(z, w) \in ((\bar{\Omega} \cap U) \times (\bar{\Omega} \cap U)) \setminus \{\text{diagonal of } \text{b}\Omega\}$ and choose

$$\delta = \delta_{NI, \Omega}(z, w) = \max\{\phi_1^*(|z_1 - w_1|), \dots, \phi_n^*(|z_n - w_n|), |r(z)|, |r(w)|\}.$$

the non-isotropic distance of Ω from z to w . Combining (3.1) with Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$(\Pi_{j=1}^n D_{z_j, \bar{w}_j}^{\alpha_j}) \mathcal{B}(z, w) = \prod_{j=1}^n (\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)))^{-2-\alpha_j} \left(\Pi_{j=1}^n D_{\hat{z}_j, \bar{\hat{w}}_j}^{\alpha_j} \right) \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w}).$$

Define $r_\delta(\hat{z}) := \frac{1}{\delta} r(\Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z}))$ for $\hat{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then the function r_δ is a defining function of Ω_δ . Moreover, for any $j = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial r_\delta}{\partial \hat{z}_j} \right| = \left| \frac{\phi_j(\delta)}{\delta} \frac{\partial r(\Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z}))}{\partial z_j} \right| \lesssim 1, \quad \text{for any } \hat{z} \in B(0, 1),$$

where the inequality follows by Definition 1.1, part 1. In fact, when $j = 1$, the inequality $\lesssim$ can be replaced by the equality $\approx$ since $\text{Re } z_1$ is the normal direction to $\text{b}\Omega$ at z_0 (see Definition 1.1). Thus

$$|\nabla_{\hat{z}} r_\delta(\hat{z})| \approx 1, \quad \text{for any } \hat{z} \in B(0, 1),$$

uniformly in δ . This means that $r_\delta(\hat{z})$ can be considered as a distance function from $\Omega_\delta \cap B(0, 1)$ to $\text{b}\Omega_\delta$. It then follows the isotropic distance $\delta_{I, \hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{I, \hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w}) &= \max\{|\hat{z} - \hat{w}|, |\hat{r}(\hat{z})|, |\hat{r}(\hat{w})|\} \\ &\approx |r_\delta(\hat{z})| + |r_\delta(\hat{w})| + \sum_{j=1}^n |\hat{z}_j - \hat{w}_j| \\ &= \frac{|r(z)|}{\delta_{NI, \Omega}(z, w)} + \frac{|r(w)|}{\delta_{NI, \Omega}(z, w)} + \frac{|z_n - w_n|}{\delta_{NI, \Omega}(z, w)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{|z_j - w_j|}{\phi(\delta_{NI, \Omega}(z, w))} \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Since the scaled distance between $\hat{z}$ and $\hat{w}$ is large, local Condition R is exactly what we need to apply Theorem 2.1 and obtain

$$|D_{\hat{z}, \hat{w}}^\gamma \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Omega}}(\hat{z}, \hat{w})| \leq C_\gamma.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 for the Bergman kernel. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is motivated by the work of McNeal and Stein [MS94].

4.1. Local L_s^p estimates. Let $s \geq 0$ be an integer. Let $\{\zeta_m : m = 0, 1, \dots, s\}$ be a sequence of cutoff functions in $C_c^\infty(U)$ so that $\zeta_0 = \chi_1$, $\zeta_s = \chi_0$, and $\zeta_m \prec \zeta_{m-1}$ for all $m = 1, \dots, s$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we define $\psi_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ so that

$$\psi_\epsilon(z, w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |z - w| < \epsilon, \\ 0 & \text{if } |z - w| > 2\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

We may choose ϵ sufficiently small such that

$$\zeta_0 = 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcup_{z \in \text{supp}(\zeta_m)} \text{supp}(\psi_\epsilon(z, \cdot)), \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq m \leq s. \tag{4.1}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_m Bv\|_{L_m^p}^p &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|\zeta_m D^\alpha Bv\|_{L_0^p}^p + \|\zeta_{m-1} Bv\|_{L_{m-1}^p}^p \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \int_\Omega \left| \int_\Omega \zeta_m D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w) v(w) dw \right|^p dz + \|\zeta_{m-1} Bv\|_{L_{m-1}^p}^p \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \left[\int_\Omega \left| \int_\Omega \zeta_m(z) (D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w) dw \right|^p dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_\Omega \left| \int_{\Omega \cap \{|z-w|>\epsilon\}} |\zeta_m(z) D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)| |v(w)| dw \right|^p dz \right] + \|\zeta_{m-1} Bv\|_{L_{m-1}^p}^p \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|B_\epsilon^\alpha v\|_{L_0^p}^p + \|v\|_{L_0^p}^p + \|\zeta_{m-1} Bv\|_{L_{m-1}^p}^p \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where B_ϵ^α is the operator of the kernel $\zeta_m(z)(D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w))\psi_\epsilon(z, w)$. Here the last inequality follows by Theorem 2.2 and consequently the constant hidden in the final $\lesssim$ depends on ϵ . To complete the proof of theorem, we need to show that for any multiindex α with $|\alpha| = m$,

$$\|B_\epsilon^\alpha v\|_{L_0^p} \lesssim \|\zeta_0 v\|_{L_m^p}. \quad (4.3)$$

Let B_0 be the operator associated with the kernel

$$\mathcal{B}_0(z, w) = \zeta_0(z) \prod \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-2} \zeta_0(w).$$

The proof of (4.3) follows immediately from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.1. *Let α be a multiindex of length m . Then for any $z \in \Omega$,*

$$|(B_\epsilon^\alpha v)(z)| \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^m (B_0 |(D^j \zeta_0 v)|)(z).$$

Lemma 4.2. *The operator*

$$B_0 : L_0^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L_0^p(\Omega)$$

for any $1 < p < \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z) &= \int_{\Omega} (\zeta_m(z) D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w) dw \\ &= I + II \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I = (-1)^m \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{3\epsilon} \cdots \int_0^{3\epsilon} \frac{d}{dt_m} \cdots \frac{d}{dt_1} \left(\zeta_m(z) D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, (w', w_n - (t_1 + \cdots + t_m))) \right) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w) dt_1 \cdots dt_m dw$$

and

$$II = \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \zeta_m(z) D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, (w', w_n - 3\epsilon j)) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w) dw.$$

For II , since $|z - (w', w_n - 3\epsilon j)| \geq 3\epsilon j - |z - w| \geq \epsilon$ for any $j \geq 1$ and $w \in \text{supp } \psi_\epsilon(z, \cdot)$, we can use Theorem 2.1 to obtain

$$|II| \lesssim \int_{\Omega} |\zeta_m(z) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w)| dw \lesssim \int_{\Omega} |\zeta_0(w) v(w)| dw \lesssim (B_0 |\zeta_0 v|)(z),$$

where the second inequality follows by (4.1) and the last one by the bound $1 \lesssim \mathcal{B}_0(z, w)$.

To estimate I , we notice that

$$\frac{d}{dt_m} \cdots \frac{d}{dt_1} \mathcal{B}(z, w_t) = (-1)^m \frac{\partial^m}{\partial (\text{Re } w_n)^m} \mathcal{B}(z, w_t)$$

where $w_t = (w', w_n - \sum_{j=1}^m t_j)$. We can write

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \text{Re } w_n} = T + aL_n,$$

where $a \in C^\infty$ and T is a tangent to $\partial\Omega$ acting in w . On other hand we know that $\mathcal{B}(z, w)$ is anti-holomorphic in w , so $L_n \mathcal{B}(z, w_t) = 0$ (here L_n acts w). Thus, we have

$$(-1)^m \frac{\partial^m}{\partial (\text{Re } w_n)^m} \mathcal{B}(z, w_t) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j T^j \mathcal{B}(z, w_t)$$

where each a_j is a C^∞ -function in w . Using integration by parts, we obtain

$$I = \sum_{j=0}^m \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{3\epsilon} \cdots \int_0^{3\epsilon} (D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w_t)) (\zeta_m(z)(T^*)^j(a_j(w)\psi_\epsilon(z, w)v(w))) dt_1 \cdots dt_m dw$$

where T^* is the $L^2(\Omega)$ -adjoint of T .

To start the estimate of the integrand on I , we use Taylor's theorem and observe

$$r(w_t) = r(w', w_n - t) = r(w) - \frac{\partial r(w)}{\partial(\operatorname{Re} w_n)} t + \frac{\partial^2 r(\tilde{w})}{\partial^2(\operatorname{Re} w_n)} t^2$$

where $\tilde{w}$ lies in the segment $[w, w_t]$. Since $\frac{\partial r(w)}{\partial(\operatorname{Re} w_n)} > 0$ and $t \in [0, 3m\epsilon]$, for small ϵ , it follows

$$|r(w_t)| \approx |r(w)| + t.$$

Since $\phi_1(\delta) = \delta$ and $\delta \leq \phi(\delta)$ for any $j = 2, \dots, n$ and any small δ ,

$$|D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w_t)| \leq (\delta_{NI}(z, w_t))^{-2-m} \prod_{j=2}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w_t))^{-2}.$$

By the definition of $\delta_{NI}(z, w_t)$ and the fact that $(w_t)_j = w_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{NI}(z, w_t) &\approx |r(z)| + |r(w_t)| + |z_1 - (w_t)_1| + \sum_{j=2}^n \phi_j^*(|z_j - (w_t)_j|) \\ &\approx |r(z)| + |r(w)| + t + |z_1 - (w_t)_1| + \sum_{j=2}^n \phi_j^*(|z_j - w_j|) \\ &\approx |r(z)| + |r(w)| + t + |z_1 - w_1| + \sum_{j=2}^n \phi_j^*(|z_j - w_j|) \\ &\approx \delta_{NI}(z, w) + t. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w_t)) \gtrsim \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w))$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$.

Next, by Theorem 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{3\epsilon} \cdots \int_0^{3\epsilon} |D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w_t)| dt_1 \cdots dt_m &\lesssim \prod_{j=2}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w_t))^{-2} \int_0^{3\epsilon} \cdots \int_0^{3\epsilon} \frac{dt_1 \cdots dt_m}{(\delta_{NI}(z, w) + \sum_{j=1}^m t_j)^{m+2}} \\ &\lesssim (\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-2} \prod_{j=2}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w_t))^{-2} = \prod_{j=1}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w_t))^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from (4.1) we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^m |\zeta_m(z)(T^*)^j(a_j(w)\psi_\epsilon(z, w)v(w))| \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^m |D_w^j \zeta_0(w)v(w)|.$$

Therefore,

$$|I| \lesssim \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^m \mathcal{B}_0(z, w) |(D^j \zeta_0 v)(w)| dw = \sum_{j=0}^m (B_0 |D^j \zeta_0 v|)(z).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.2. From the fact that $\phi_j(a+b) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\phi_j(a) + \phi_j(b))$, it follows

$$\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)) \gtrsim |z_j - w_j| + \phi_j \left(|r(z)| + |r(w)| + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \phi_k^*(|z_k - w_k|) \right)$$

for $j = 2, \dots, n$. Thus, for $0 < \eta < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\eta(z) &= \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{B}_0(z, w)| |r(w)|^{-\eta} dw \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega \cap U} \frac{dw}{|r(w)|^\eta \delta_{NI}^2(z, w) \prod_{j=2}^n (\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)))^2} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{\delta_0} \cdots \int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{\rho_2 \cdots \rho_n dr d\rho_2 \cdots d\rho_n dy_n}{r^\eta (y_n + r + |r(z)| + \sum_{j=2}^n \phi_j^*(\rho_j))^2 \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\rho_j + \phi_j(r + |r(z)| + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \phi_k^*(\rho_k)) \right)^2} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{\delta_0} \cdots \int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{dr d\rho_2 \cdots d\rho_n}{r^\eta (r + |r(z)| + \sum_{j=2}^n \phi_j^*(\rho_j))^2 \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\rho_j + \phi_j(r + |r(z)| + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \phi_k^*(\rho_k)) \right)} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by using polar coordinates in $w_j - z_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$ with $\rho_j := |w_j - z_j|$ and the variable changes $r := -r(w)$, $y_n = |\operatorname{Im} z_n - \operatorname{Im} w_n|$. Using the hypothesis $\frac{\phi_j(\delta)}{\delta}$ decreasing is equivalent to $\frac{\phi_j^*(\delta)}{\delta}$ increasing for δ sufficiently small. So we may use the argument of Lemma 3.2 in [Kha13] to establish

$$\int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{d\rho}{A_j + \phi_j^*(\rho_j)} \lesssim \frac{\phi_j(A_j)}{A_j} \quad (4.4)$$

where $A_j = r + |r(z)| + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \phi_k^*(\rho_k)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\eta(z) &\lesssim \int_0^{\delta_0} \cdots \int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{dr d\rho_2 \cdots d\rho_{n-1}}{r^\eta (r + |r(z)| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \phi_j^*(\rho_j)) \prod_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(\rho_j + \phi_j(r + |r(z)| + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \phi_k^*(\rho_k)) \right)} \\ &\lesssim \cdots \lesssim \int_0^{\delta_0} \frac{dr}{r^\eta (r + |r(z)|)} \approx \frac{1}{|r(w)|^\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Let q be the conjugate exponent of p and $v \in L^p(\Omega)$. An application of Hölder's inequality establishes

$$\begin{aligned} |(B_0 v)(z)|^p &= \left(\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}_0(z, w) v(w) dw \right)^p \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{B}_0(z, w)| |v(w)|^p |r(w)|^{\eta p/q} dw \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{B}_0(z, w)| |r(w)|^{-\eta} dw \right)^{p/q} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{B}_0(z, w)| |v(w)|^p |r(w)|^{\eta p/q} dw \right) |r(z)|^{-\eta p/q}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_0 v\|_p^p &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{B}_0(z, w)| |v(w)|^p |r(w)|^{\eta p/q} |r(z)|^{-\eta p/q} dw dz \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} I_{\eta p/q}(w) |v(w)|^p |r(w)|^{\eta p/q} dw \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} |v(w)|^p dw = \|v\|_p^p \end{aligned}$$

if $\eta < q/p$. This completes the proof of this lemma. $\square$

4.2. Local Hölder estimates. We consider the classical Hölder spaces.

Definition 4.3. The space $\Lambda_s(\Omega)$ is defined by:

1. For $0 < s < 1$,

$$\Lambda_s(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \|u\|_{\Lambda_s} := \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{z, z+h \in \Omega} \frac{|u(z+h) - u(z)|}{|h|^\alpha} < \infty \right\}.$$

2. For $s > 1$ and non-integer,

$$\Lambda_s(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \|u\|_{\Lambda_s} := \|D^\alpha u\|_{\Lambda_{s-[\alpha]}} < \infty, \text{ for all } \alpha \text{ such that } |\alpha| \leq [s] \right\}.$$

Here $[s]$ is the greatest integer less than s .

3. For $s = 1$,

$$\Lambda_1(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \|u\|_{\Lambda_1} := \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{z, z+h, z-h \in \Omega} \frac{|u(z+h) + u(z-h) - 2u(z)|}{|h|} < \infty \right\}.$$

4. For $s > 1$ and integer,

$$\Lambda_s(\Omega) = \{ u : \|u\|_{\Lambda_s} := \|D^\alpha u\|_{\Lambda_1} < \infty, \text{ for all } \alpha \text{ such that } |\alpha| \leq s-1 \}.$$

From [MS97, §3], we have the following equivalent formulation of the Hölder spaces.

Proposition 4.4. Let $s > 0$. A function $u \in \Lambda_s$ if and only if for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k > s$, there are functions u_k so that $u = \sum_{k=1}^\infty u_k$ and

- (i) $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim 2^{-ks} \|u\|_{\Lambda_s}$
- (ii) $\|D^m u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim 2^{mk} 2^{-ks} \|u\|_{\Lambda_s}.$

The existence of $\{u_k\}$ is equivalent to the decomposition $u = g_k + b_k$ where

- (1) $\|b_k\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-ks} \|u\|_{\Lambda_s}$
- (2) $\|D^j g_k\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{k(j-s)} \|u\|_{\Lambda_s}, \text{ for any } j \leq m.$

Proof. In the case that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, Stein proves the equivalence of $u \in \Lambda_s$ with (i) and (ii) holding as a consequence of the pseudodifferential calculus [Ste93, §VI.5]. Essentially, u is decomposed into $\sum u_k$ using the standard dyadic difference operators. When $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, McNeal and Stein point out that the extension theorems in Stein [Ste70, Chapter VI] allow us to pass from Ω to $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The equivalence of (i) and (ii) with (1) and (2) is straight forward. Given $u = \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty u_\ell$, take $b_k = \sum_{\ell=k}^\infty u_\ell$ and $g_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} u_\ell$. Conversely, given $u = g_k + b_k$, observe that $g_k - g_{k+1} = b_{k+1} - b_k$. Consequently, if we take $u_k = g_k - g_{k+1}$, then u_k satisfies the desired estimates. $\square$

The following proposition is essentially due to Hardy and Littlewood. For a proof, see Nagel and Stein [NS79, Chapter III, Proposition 3]

Proposition 4.5. Let $s > 0$. If $u \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$|\nabla^m u(z)| \leq A |r(z)|^{-(m-s)} \text{ for every } z \in \Omega$$

for every $m > s$, then $u \in \Lambda_s(\Omega)$ and $\|u\|_{\Lambda_s(\Omega)} \lesssim A + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for local Hölder estimates. Our goal is to establish the estimate

$$\|\chi_0 Bv\|_{\Lambda_s} \lesssim \|\chi_1 v\|_{\Lambda_s} + \|v\|_{L^\infty} \tag{4.5}$$

Let $m = [s] + 1$. An application of Proposition 4.5 reduces the proof of (4.5) to showing

$$|\nabla^m \chi_0 Bv(z)| \lesssim |r(z)|^{-(m-s)} (\|\chi_1 v\|_{\Lambda_s} + \|v\|_{L^\infty})$$

We let $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=0}^m$ and $\psi_\epsilon(z, w)$ be as in Theorem 1.2 so that We choose ϵ sufficiently small such that

$$\zeta_0 = 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcup_{z \in \text{supp}(\zeta_j)} \text{supp}(\psi_\epsilon(z, \cdot)), \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^m \zeta_m Bv(z)| &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |\zeta_m D^\alpha Bv(z)| + |\nabla^{m-1} \zeta_{m-1} Bv(z)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \left| \int_{\Omega} \zeta_m(z) D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w) \psi_\epsilon(z, w) v(w) dw \right| + \int_{\Omega} |v(w)| dw + |\nabla^{m-1} \zeta_{m-1} Bv(z)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| + |\nabla^{m-1} \zeta_{m-1} Bv(z)| + \|v\|_{L^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $|B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)|$, we use the following lemmas:

Lemma 4.6. *For any $z \in U$ and multiindex α of length m , we have*

$$|B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| \lesssim |r(z)|^{-m} \|\zeta_0 v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of B_ϵ^α and the fact that $\zeta_0 \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp} \zeta_m$ that

$$|B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| \lesssim \|\zeta_0 v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega \cap U} \zeta_0(w) |D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)| dw.$$

Next, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)| &\lesssim (\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-m-2} \prod_{j=2}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-2} \\ &\lesssim |r(z)|^{-m+\eta} |r(w)|^{-\eta} (\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-2} \prod_{j=2}^n \phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w))^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

for any $z, w \in \Omega \cap U$, where $0 < \eta < 1$. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega \cap U} |D_z^\alpha \mathcal{B}(z, w)| dw \lesssim |r(z)|^{-m+\eta} I_\eta(z) \lesssim |r(z)|^{-m}$$

Here the last inequality follows the estimate of I_η in the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.7. *For any $z \in U$ and multiindex α of length m , we have*

$$|B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| \lesssim |r(z)|^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|D^j \zeta_0 v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Repeating the argument of Lemma 4.1 leads to the inequality

$$|B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|D^j \zeta_0 v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega \cap U} \frac{\zeta_0(z) dw}{(\delta_{NI}(z, w))^3 \prod_{j=2}^n (\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)))^2}.$$

Also, the proof of Lemma 4.6 immediately yields

$$\int_{\Omega \cap U} \frac{\zeta_0(z) dw}{(\delta_{NI}(z, w))^3 \prod_{j=2}^n (\phi_j(\delta_{NI}(z, w)))^2} \lesssim |r(z)|^{-1}.$$

□

We now return to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Choose k such that $2^{-k} = |r(z)|$. Since $\zeta_0 v \in \Lambda^s(\Omega)$, by Proposition 4.4 there exists g_k and b_k such that

$$\zeta_0 v = g_k + b_k, \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

where

$$\|b_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim 2^{-ks} \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s(\Omega)} = |r(z)|^s \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s(\Omega)}$$

and

$$\|D^j g_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim 2^{k(j-s)} \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s(\Omega)} = |r(z)|^{-(j-s)} \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for any } j \leq m.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |B_\epsilon^\alpha v(z)| &\leq |B_\epsilon^\alpha \zeta_0^{-1} b_k(z)| + |B_\epsilon^\alpha \zeta_0^{-1} g_k(z)| \\ &\lesssim |r(z)|^{-m} \|b_k\|_{L^\infty} + |r(z)|^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|D^j g_k\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s} \left(|r(z)|^{-m} |r(z)|^s + |r(z)|^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |r(z)|^{-(j-s)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|\zeta_0 v\|_{\Lambda^s} |r(z)|^{-(m-s)}. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Proposition 4.5 completes the proof. $\square$

5. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.5

Our main theorem in this subsection is

Theorem 5.1. *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in C^n and p be a boundary point. Assume that Ω is h -extendible at p with multitype $\mathcal{M}(p) = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$. Then the dilation $\Phi_\delta(z)$ with each component $\phi_k(\delta) = \delta^{1/m_k}$ is a good dilation.*

Proof. Since $|\frac{\partial r}{\partial z_1}(z)| \approx 1 = \frac{\delta}{\delta}$ for any $z \in U$. We only need to check the condition A for $j = 2, \dots, n$. Let $z = \Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z}) = (\delta \hat{z}_1, \delta^{1/m_2} \hat{z}_2, \dots, \delta^{1/m_n} \hat{z}_n) \in \Phi_\delta^{-1}(B(0, 1)) \subset U$ where $\hat{z} = (\hat{z}_1, \dots, \hat{z}_n) \in B(0, 1)$. From (1.3) and (1.4), it follows

$$|\frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j}(\Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z}))| = |\frac{\delta}{\delta^{1/m_j}} P(\hat{z})| \lesssim \delta^{1-1/m_j},$$

and

$$|\frac{\partial R}{\partial z_j}(\Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z}))| \lesssim o(\delta^{1-1/m_j}).$$

Hence,

$$|\frac{\partial r}{\partial z_j}(z)| \lesssim \delta^{1-1/m_j}$$

for any $z \in \Phi_\delta^{-1}(B(0, 1))$. Let

$$\hat{r}_\delta(\hat{z}) := \frac{1}{\delta} r(\Phi_\delta^{-1}(\hat{z})) = \text{Re } \hat{z}_1 + P(\hat{z}') + o(\delta^{\eta/m_j} |\hat{z}_j|^{m_j+\eta}).$$

When $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $\Omega_\delta \rightarrow D$ where D is an associated model for Ω at p . Then Ω_δ is also an h -extendible domain with multitype $\mathcal{M}(p) = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ uniformly in δ . In [Cat87], Catlin constructs a family of plurisubharmonic functions that for some $\epsilon > 0$ that only depends on $\mathcal{M}(p)$ and any $\eta > 0$ there exists a plurisubharmonic function ψ^η such that $|\psi^\eta| \lesssim 1$ and $i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi^\eta \gtrsim \eta^{-2\epsilon} \text{Id}$ on the strip $B(0, 1) \cap \{\hat{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n : -\eta < \hat{r}_\delta(\hat{z}) < 0\}$, uniformly in δ and η . That implies that an ϵ -subelliptic estimate for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem holds uniformly in η . Therefore, the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator

associated to Ω_δ is locally regular with uniform estimates in δ . Consequently, the local Condition R holds at $\Phi_\delta(p)$ of Ω_δ . $\square$

REFERENCES

- [BL80] S. Bell and E. Ligocka. A simplification and extension of Fefferman’s theorem on biholomorphic mappings. *Invent. Math.*, 57(3):283–289, 1980. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01418930>.
- [Boa87] H. Boas. Extension of Kerzman’s theorem on differentiability of the Bergman kernel function. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 37(3):495–499, 1987.
- [BS91] H. Boas and E. Straube. Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator on domains in $\mathbf{C}^n$ admitting a defining function that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary. *Math. Z.*, 206:81–88, 1991.
- [BSY95] H. Boas, E. Straube, and J.Y. Yu. Boundary limits of the Bergman kernel and metric. *Mich. Math. J.*, 42:449–461, 1995.
- [Cat83] D. Catlin. Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. *Ann. of Math.*, 117:147–171, 1983.
- [Cat84] D. Catlin. Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. In *Complex analysis of several variables (Madison, Wis., 1982)*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 41, pages 39–49. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [Cat87] D. Catlin. Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains. *Ann. of Math.*, 126:131–191, 1987.
- [CD06] P. Charpentier and Y. Dupain. Estimates for the Bergman and Szegő projections for pseudoconvex domains of finite type with locally diagonalizable Levi form. *Publ. Mat.*, 50(2):413–446, 2006.
- [Chr88] M. Christ. Regularity properties of the $\bar{\partial}_b$ equation on weakly pseudoconvex CR manifolds of dimension 3. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1:587–646, 1988.
- [CNS92] D.-C. Chang, A. Nagel, and E.M. Stein. Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem in pseudoconvex domains of finite type in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Acta Math.*, 169:153–228, 1992.
- [D’A82] J.P. D’Angelo. Real hypersurfaces, orders of contact, and applications. *Ann. of Math.*, 115:615–637, 1982.
- [FK72] G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn. *The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann Complex*, volume 75 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1972.
- [FK88a] C. Fefferman and J.J. Kohn. Estimates of kernels on three-dimensional CR manifolds. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 4(3-4):355–405, 1988.
- [FK88b] C. Fefferman and J.J. Kohn. Hölder estimates on domains of complex dimension two and on three dimensional CR manifolds. *Adv. in Math.*, 69:233–303, 1988.
- [FKM90] C. Fefferman, J.J. Kohn, and M. Machedon. Hölder estimates on CR manifolds with a diagonalizable Levi form. *Adv. in Math.*, 84:1–90, 1990.
- [FS74] G.B. Folland and E.M. Stein. Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex and analysis on the Heisenberg group. *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.*, 27:429–522, 1974.
- [Har11] P. Harrington. Global regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator and bounded plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions. *Adv. Math.*, 228(4):2522–2551, 2011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2011.07.008>.
- [Ker72] N. Kerzman. The Bergman kernel function. Differentiability at the boundary. *Math. Ann.*, 195:149–158, 1972.
- [Kha13] T. Khanh. Supnorm and f -Hölder estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ on convex domains of general type in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 403(2):522–531, 2013.
- [KN65] J.J. Kohn and L. Nirenberg. Non-coercive boundary value problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 18:443–492, 1965.
- [Koe02] K. Koenig. On maximal Sobolev and Hölder estimates for the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator and boundary Laplacian. *Amer. J. Math.*, 124:129–197, 2002.
- [Mac88] M. Machedon. Estimates for the parametrix of the Kohn Laplacian on certain domains. *Invent. Math.*, 91:339–364, 1988.
- [McN89] J.D. McNeal. Boundary behavior of the Bergman kernel function in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Duke Math. J.*, 58:499–512, 1989.
- [McN94] J.D. McNeal. Estimates on the Bergman kernels of convex domains. *Adv. Math.*, 109:108–139, 1994.
- [McN02] J.D. McNeal. A sufficient condition for compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 195(1):190–205, 2002.
- [MS94] J.D. McNeal and E.M. Stein. Mapping properties of the Bergman projection on convex domains of finite type. *Duke Math. J.*, 73:177–199, 1994.
- [MS97] J.D. McNeal and E.M. Stein. The Szegő projection on convex domains. *Math. Z.*, 224:519–553, 1997.
- [NRSW89] A. Nagel, J.-P. Rosay, E.M. Stein, and S. Wainger. Estimates for the Bergman and Szegő kernels in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Ann. of Math.*, 129:113–149, 1989.

- [NS79] A. Nagel and E.M. Stein. *Lectures on pseudodifferential operators: regularity theorems and applications to nonelliptic problems*, volume 24 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1979.
- [NS06] A. Nagel and E.M. Stein. The $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex on decoupled domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$. *Ann. of Math.*, 164:649–713, 2006.
- [PS77] D.H. Phong and E.M. Stein. Estimates for the Bergman and Szegő projections on strongly pseudo-convex domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 44(3):695–704, 1977.
- [Ste70] E.M. Stein. *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [Ste93] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*. Princeton Mathematical Series; 43. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1993.
- [Str08] E. Straube. A sufficient condition for global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator. *Adv. Math.*, 217(3):1072–1095, 2008.
- [Yu94] J.Y. Yu. Peak functions on weakly pseudoconvex domains. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 43(4):1271–1295, 1994.
- [Yu95] J.Y. Yu. Weighted boundary limits of the generalized Kobayashi-Royden metrics on weakly pseudoconvex domains. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 347(2):587–614, 1995. 10.2307/2154903.

T. V. KHANH

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG, NSW 2522, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: tkhanh@uow.edu.au

A. RAICH

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SCEN 327, 1 UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, AR 72701, USA
E-mail address: araich@uark.edu